

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

TERRANCE LEON JACKSON,

Defendant.

Case No. 22-cr-20628

Honorable Robert J. White

---

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT’S MOTION “FOR TIME CREDIT”**

---

Before the Court is Defendant Terrance Leon Jackson’s *pro se* motion “for time credit.” Defendant asks the Court to correct its “judgment of commitment” and “give [him] 477 [days] time credit” because his federal sentence was meant to be concurrent to any sentence arising from other, outstanding cases, and his “time” is “wrong.” (ECF No. 63). In response, the government argues that Defendant’s request is without merit because his sentence and time credited are correct. (ECF No. 65).

The purpose of Defendant’s motion is not wholly clear. To the extent he alleges some error with respect to his sentence being concurrent and/or the calculation of time-served credit for his sentence, the record shows that the Court gave Defendant a concurrent sentence in this case, and the Bureau of Prisons

calculated 477 days “total prior credit time” for his sentence. (ECF No. 63, PageID.576). It is therefore unclear what, if any, error there is to correct. Furthermore, “the power to grant credit for time served lies solely with the Attorney General and the Bureau of Prisons.” *United States v. Crozier*, 259 F.3d 503, 520 (6th Cir. 2001) (citing 18 U.S.C. § 3585(b); *United States v. Wilson*, 503 U.S. 329, 333 (1992)). Therefore, “district courts have no authority under § 3585(b) ‘to compute the credit at sentencing.’” *United States v. McKenzie*, No. 22-3713, 2023 U.S. App. LEXIS 13650, at \*1 (6th Cir. June 1, 2023) (quoting *Wilson*, 503 U.S. at 334).

Accordingly, the Court ORDERS that Defendant’s motion (ECF No. 63) is DENIED.

Dated: April 8, 2025

s/Robert J. White

Robert J. White

United States District Judge